

February 6, 2012

Carole Williams
P.O. Box 98
Pelkie, Michigan 49958

Senator Tom Casperson, Chairman
Natural Resources, Environment and Great Lakes Committee
State of Michigan

Re: Committee hearing on the MI-DNR's proposed Biologically Significant Areas

Dear Honorable Senator Casperson,

As I'm unable to travel from the northwestern Upper Peninsula to Gaylord for the committee hearing today, I'm hoping this letter will serve to make my comments regarding the Michigan Department of Natural Resources' proposed Biologically Significant Areas (BSAs) heard by all members of the committee.

After a great deal of online research, I was able to locate the proposed list of properties, which include not just State-owned land in the northern Lower Peninsula region, but also land owned by the Federal Government, Nature Conservancies and unnamed private entities or individuals. It's my understanding that the same will be happening in southern Lower Michigan, as well as in the Upper Peninsula.

As one who has over the past several years researched and written about the eco-environmental movement, including the UN-driven "Wildlands Project", which stemmed from a UN Biodiversity Treaty that has never been ratified by the U.S. Congress, I'm alarmed at what I believe to be happening in my beloved State of Michigan.

Although the Biodiversity Treaty wasn't ratified, its mandates are being adhered to due to an Executive Order issued by former President Clinton, through which his administration developed the Commission on Sustainable Development and an ecosystem approach to managing our nation's natural resources.

I'm quite knowledgeable about the tangled web of partnerships between various federal and state government natural resource agencies, certain nongovernmental eco-environmental conservation organizations, the UN's World Conservation Union and the UN's "Man and the Biosphere" Program, all of which are compliant with the Wildlands Project plan. The plan entails "rewilding" at least 50 percent of our nation's landmass to a visionary concept of a pre-Christopher Columbus America. This has been going forward on an in-state regional basis for quite some time, but will insidiously meld into a multi-state and then national basis. This is happening in Canada and Mexico, as well.

In 1997 David Hales, a former Michigan Nature Conservancy board member and Director of the Michigan DNR from 1988 to 1991, was appointed to a three-year term as chairman of the U.S. National Committee for the UN Man and the Biosphere Program. Certainly, over those years his stewardship of the MI-DNR and help in laying the groundwork for the Wildlands Project in Michigan not only had much to do with his national appointment, but also served to help bring us to the point we're at today in Michigan with resource management.

For many years, the MI-DNR has been implementing the Wildlands Project under a cloak of darkness and deception, and doing so without permission of the state's registered voters, who were never asked through a ballot initiative or by any other means if they want the agency to micro-manage our natural resources; micro-management that will ultimately infringe upon our private and public property rights, as well as our Constitutional right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

To this day, the MI-DNR has failed to be candid with the public about the nature of the Man and the Biosphere Program, UN Biospheres (there are at least two in Michigan), the Wildlands Project, or what ecosystem management will eventually entail, particularly highly restrictive land use mandates imposed on the public once Biologically Significant Areas are designated to become part of its Living Legacies Program.

I highly suggest that the Senate Natural Resources, Environment and Great Lakes Committee study this issue further and allow more time in the future for more testimony to be heard from the public.

Sincerely,

Carole Williams

INVASIVE SPECIES – A MEANS TO AN END

By Jim Beers

It was during the early 1900's that Federal and state governments began to hire employees and organize concerted programs to actively manage fish, wildlife, and plants. Birds and fish were managed to provide sustainable, annual harvests for recreational and commercial purposes. Large mammals were managed to provide citizens with sport and meat year after year. Small mammals were managed to provide fur or winter meals to rural families and urban residents who enjoyed hunting or trapping. Trees were managed to provide sustainable timber products, wildlife, erosion control, grazing, and a pleasant landscape. Streams were managed to provide fish, recreation, power, drinking water, irrigation, and commercial transportation while minimizing the damage caused by floods or droughts. Songbirds, amphibians, and plants were studied and categorized by Universities and groups of citizens like the Audubon Society influenced other citizens to provide for these lesser-known species as citizens went about their daily activities.

It was during the middle part of the century that the Federal government hired more employees and began to purchase, proclaim, and "protect" land units on a regular basis. Wetlands were bought and made "National Wildlife Refuges." Battlefields and places of beauty or wonder were bought and proclaimed "National Parks." Woodlands were bought or reserved from the Federal landholdings in the West and proclaimed "National Forests." Western grasslands and what were fairly termed wastelands were not turned over to the states as was done in other states and eventually were proclaimed BLM (for Bureau of Land Management) grazing lands. These last were leased routinely for grazing, mining, and other uses while the others on a scale from the Forests to the Parks allowed many (multiple) to limited uses.

Up to the 1970's, Federal employees, Federal statutes (laws), Federal regulations, and Federal and state programs all recognized that they existed to manage the natural resources on these landholding for the wise and sustainable uses of citizens. The employees were trained by Universities to do this job and governments hired and promoted based on proven performance to manage natural resources. The plants and animals are termed renewable natural resources and oil, gas, coal, and minerals are called non-renewable natural resources. All were managed and harvested or extracted using the best management practices known at the time.

When the public accepted the Endangered Species Act and the Animal Welfare Act in the early 1970's things changed dramatically. The future for US Department of the Interior employees (where the Refuges, Parks, and Grazing Lands were managed) moved away from managing resources for people to managing plants and animals to protect them from any and all uses. The Endangered Species Act (administered by the US Department of the Interior) corrupted the sensible management of natural resources by the employees of that period by being the growth part of employment and the basis for most bonuses and promotions. New employees whispered resentments at the way old programs managed for sustainable uses and assured that new programs did not allow uses. Steadily the old programs changed. An example is the way the 20-year old, always unsuccessful attempt to get millions of dollars by taxing binoculars, camping gear, etc. to buy "non-game" lands was always intended to be lands without any sustainable uses of resources. During the last Administration persistent attempts were made to modify policies and even regulations that would eliminate management or use of all resources on the Refuges, Parks, and Grazing Lands. Some limited progress was made by the illicit use of Executive Orders around election time and Presidential Proclamations prohibiting certain uses on certain areas like the coal under Southern Utah Grazing Lands or offshore oil development to gain votes in states like California and Florida.

A parallel development took place in the US Department of Agriculture that manages the National Forests and administers the Animal Welfare Act. The future for employees left management and use programs and became focused on eliminating uses and cooperating with the socialist-oriented, no-use power-brokers like the Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, the US Humane Society, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Animal Protection Institute. As happened at the Department of the Interior, promotions and bonuses were given for eliminating management and uses and new employees hired from the power-brokers assured that new and old programs reflected this change. Again, Executive Orders and Proclamations imposed Roadless Areas, de facto Wilderness', and prohibitions on natural gas extraction in the midst of power shortages and mideast terror.

The recent growth of the Federal government, the astronomical increases in the Federal budget for these Departments, and the modifications of national rights and jurisdictions from private property to states rights due to these two laws and these two Departments is a matter of record known to all. The Federal and state bureaucrats

who have witnessed the effect on their employment, careers, and power know that this expansion can go on for a long time but like the changes I mentioned during the last century there is the "Mother of all Government Programs" on their horizon. They plan to enlist all the "usual suspects" from the last thirty years to help get them there. The University professors, the power-brokers, and the reelection-obsessed politicians will all help willingly to get their piece of the action.

This next and apparently unlimited guarantee of budget increases, employment increases, promotions, bonuses, and most-importantly power increase is something called the RESTORATION OF PRE-COLUMBIAN ECOSYSTEMS. Its' greatest features are that it is both impossible and immeasurable. Never mind that it is also foolish and nonsensical. However, if the "general public" et al, can be made to believe in or accept the fallacies of the Endangered Species Act (like the "need" or desirability of wolves or the wisdom of eliminating logging and entire rural communities for imaginary effects on owls or lynx) they will believe anything. Goebbels fed the Germans ever-greater lies, just like getting a dog to eat more and more over time, and it apparently worked. The bureaucratic "success" of the past thirty years has illuminated a darker future for us all.

The American public accepts the lie that the plants and animals that were "here" in 1492 AD were somehow designated (certainly not by God, but then by who?) as the best or highest or only such plant or animal to be at any given location today. Never mind that millions of us living incredibly different lives make that impossible. Never mind that the pre-European US environment of 1492 AD is as different from today's environment in the US as the Mississippi is from the Amazon. Never mind that thousands of plants and animals have arrived in hundreds of different ways and their seeds, their crossbreeding, their uses, their effects, and their superior abilities to compete (when they survive) mean they are here to stay every bit as much as the oldest living species in the middle of Nebraska. Never mind that the bureaucrats whine about eradicating a grass you have never encountered but will eventually be eradicating plants in your landscaping or garden. Always remember the Endangered Species Act was touted as "saving" bald eagles (another lie) but never mentioned putting loggers out of business for an owl or causing Southern California homes to burn up because of a rodent.

No, and you can take this to the bank per an old wildlife biologist, there is nothing sacred, good, or desirable about Pre-Columbian Ecosystems or treating any plants or animals differently based on their time here. Sure, keep out new ones as best you can based on what we know. Sure eradicate or redistribute some plants or animals based on their effects or on the needs of people. Sure let the Federal government do their job regulating import, export, and interstate commerce while states administer all the plants and animals within their state as they see fit. But don't, whatever they tell you, accept the notion that the Federal government has any mandate for the silly, immeasurable, never-ending, unimaginably expensive, and impossible task of restoring Pre-Columbian Ecosystems.

That said, there is a big push to do just this today. All of the proposed bills before Congress that have a Title or Section that mentions INVASIVE SPECIES does just that. If the Federal government proclaims a mandate to attack INVASIVE SPECIES it automatically tells the Courts and every bureaucrat that ONLY NATIVE (Pre-1492 AD) SPECIES are to remain everywhere in the USA. Think of the money, the people, the land, the grants, the programs, the bonuses, the permits, the land needed, the POWER "necessary" to begin and continue this bureaucratic attack on everything from brown trout to all the clovers. It can never be accomplished, it can never be measured, there will never be a lack of new "problems" needing "more", and the power needed (like the species identified) can only increase. It literally boggles the mind. No bureaucrat since the mandarins in ancient China ever conceived of a greater self-serving program for unlimited expansion over an unlimited number of decades or even centuries. All this and what was once the best educated public in the history of man ready to swallow it like a bass eyeing a hula popper overhead.

If you can, tell your Senator, tell your Congressman, and tell your state representatives that you do not want the Federal government responsible for anything except the import, export, or interstate commerce involving new species that may harm the current natural or commercial environment of the United States. Tell them that you want the Constitutionally mandated responsibility for all plants and animals (wild and domestic) to remain with the state governments.

This is already longer than I planned, but I will be writing more about the current rush of activities here in Washington concerning INVASIVE SPECIES over the next few months. I will try to make this all more understandable as I try to sift the wheat from the chaff. Share this with a friend and thanks for taking the time to read it.

Jim Beers
29 March 2003

TNC & Easements

http://www.sierratimes.com/03/arc_page.php?author=Nancy%20Levant

The Upper Peninsula of Michigan - Perhaps The Most Endangered Place in America

Nancy Levant with contributions from Yooper, C.J. Williams

If you have never been there, it is impossible to describe the beauty. The Upper Peninsula, the U.P., is a very unique place on Earth. Carved eons ago by water and ice, the Upper Peninsula of Michigan is a wonderland of rich emerald forests, small sun-streaked mountains, and meandering rivers.

Bordered on all but one side by Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior, the U.P. lakeshore ranges from softly drifting sand to rocky covered beaches where agates and other treasures can be found to fill children's pockets. Sunsets are magnificent and the colorful rays of the Aurora Borealis can often be seen dancing overhead.

This is what "Yoopers" call God's Country, a place where contentment means kicking back and doing absolutely nothing. It is a place filled with large game and predators. The U.P. is home to forests and air that literally takes your breath away. One cannot help but be changed by the forests of the U.P., by the waters large and small, by the boulders, jasper, agate, and the wildlife, all of which force humans to relinquish all vanities.

In the U.P., people are only people, and they are not rulers of anything - except for one thing; the people of the U.P. are the rulers of a true custodial knowledge of nature, for it is nature, in its kindness and fury, that has defined who they are and what they know. Yoopers are a fiercely proud lot. The U.P. community was built on the blood, sweat, and tears of miners, loggers, and settlers of many nationalities who, today, are still held together by neighborliness and sharing with newcomers who decide to brave the stay and plant their roots. The natives of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan may be Michiganders, but they call themselves "Yoopers" and refer to downstaters, those living below the Mackinaw Bridge, as "Trolls".

Their collective identity is very different from that of the Lower Peninsula of Michigan. Yoopers feel separate yet collectively united in unique livelihoods that are built on the land, water, and wildlife of the most-northern part of Michigan. Yoopers have learned to survive in untamed nature by becoming a part and caretaker of an untarnished eco-system. Yoopers have learned to fish, hunt, and trap for their livings to meet needs. They have learned to serve the simple requirements of sportsman who come from all over the world to this uncommon and majestic landscape. They have learned the balance of maintaining healthy food chains, and they know full well what is necessary when that balance is tipped. By nature, Yoopers are not polluters or materialists.

They are not greedy or demanding. They are not rich, nor do they desire to be, for their great wealth is a collective wealth - the U.P. itself - and they all know this and stay despite the winters, the mosquitoes, the black flies, the swamps, and the thousand hardships that come to their humble and devoted spirits. They are truly lovers of the land and its creatures, and their knowledge of it is exquisite. For certain, it is a heavenly place on Earth, and the Yoopers are kind and hardy, skilled and generous. But, the U.P. is in trouble, and every American needs to understand what is happening to that beloved place.

Here's why: The U.P. has been overrun by eco-green armies of bio-diversity conservationists whose trumpet is "sustainable development," and whose battalions are intent on grabbing as much land and water as possible, and quickly before an alarm is sounded. Though there are many players in the U.P. land grab, most fingers point to **The Nature Conservancy (TNC), which is**

now partnered with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and other government agencies.

Approximately 86% of the land in the U.P. is government and/or corporately owned. **Several highly placed corporate officers sit on TNC's board and are looking the other way as U.P. citizens are stripped of their lands and livelihoods.** The **President and CEO of a very large corporation, who is currently wheeling and dealing with state government and TNC, is also a former TNC senior executive.** It is therefore no surprise that more and more use restrictions called "**conservation easements**" are set into place and with more easement planning in the works as we speak.

Large areas of acreage and water are under the "protection" of TNC, but that protection is far more akin to absolute control, and particularly when it comes to traditional and public use of that hunting land. **As daily land grabbing continues by the government and TNC,** true nature lovers find themselves at the stakeholders table, begging for motorized access to the areas where hunting, fishing, wild berry picking, and picnicking on hot summer days have been enjoyed for centuries.

Now, young lads on ATV's enter "protected" areas, where they have always had access, but the gates are shut and police are called. Now many visitors are required to use guides (or guards) and must remain exclusively on designated walkways so that habitats are undisturbed. The economy of the U.P. is contingent upon mining, logging, and tourism industries, with whitetail deer hunting being the most profitable. The mining industry, however is being intentionally and systematically destroyed; the logging industry is being intentionally and systematically destroyed; and tourism will soon be relegated to "eco-touring," which simply put is, "look, but don't touch."

The Upper Peninsula and its people cannot survive without the ability of visitors and sportsmen to touch, adore, walk, ride into, and be a part of the north woods. Yoopers are now told that deer themselves are destroying the habitat of neo-tropical migratory birds, nesting birds, and carnivorous predators such as the rampaging population of wolves infesting citizens' yards. **The deer must go, says TNC,** and they've gone so far as to offer to work with the state legislature and Department of Natural Resources to find alternative funding for deer licenses so that reduction in herd size does not economically impact the DNR. How terribly thoughtful...

Something has to be done about the Upper Peninsula. 86% of the land is government and corporate-owned, and **Isle Royale, currently administered by the National Park Service, is a United Nations' Biosphere Reserve** - the entire island (a place where U.N. peace keeping forces can be stationed, but where power boaters are fighting to go). And to this day, the TNC, together with the DNR, and others continue efforts to "protect" more and more acreage in the U.P. from people under the ruse of "for the public good." If one didn't know better, one might suspect that the truthful goal is to remove the last Yooper from the U.P.

Websites for Wisdom:

http://tnc-ecomanagement.org/images/MI_U.P..pdf http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-10370_12141-32952--,00.html <http://nature.org/wherewework/northamerica/states/michigan/> <http://www.keweenawnow.com/> <http://www.phillyburbs.com/pb-dyn/news/172-11152002-175.html> <http://www.nwf.org/nationalwildlife/article.cfm?issueID=19&articleID=163>

Required reading for those who are learning all they can about Agenda 21 - UNSustainable Redevelopment, as it applies to America and its citizens. Ignorance is temporary - Stupid is forever...

Elected officials must learn what Agenda 21 is before opening their mouths and revealing their ignorance

Rep. Herger is wrong about Agenda 21

Henry Lamb Sunday, February 5, 2012

To listen click here

California Representative Wally Herger offered an article on Agenda 21 which, unfortunately, reflects a lack of knowledge about Agenda 21 - shared by far too many elected officials. In the first instance, he said that Agenda 21 is a document developed at a U.N. Conference in 1993.

Wrong!

Agenda 21 was developed over a period of time, traceable from the 1972 U.N. Conference on the Environment, which identified "environmental protection" as the world's greatest problem, and gave the world the U.N. Environmental Programme, followed almost immediately by Nixon's Executive Order that created the EPA.

Then came the 1976 U.N. Conference on Human Settlements, signed by the U.S., which proclaimed that "Public control of land use is...indispensible." The next major step was the creation of the U.N. World Commission on Environment and Development in 1983, chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland. The commission issued its final report in 1987, called Our Common Future. This document produced the concept and defined the term "Sustainable Development" to be: "Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."

This rather ambiguous definition was spelled out in great detail in a 40-chapter, 300-page document titled Agenda 21, signed and adopted by 179 nations in 1992 (not 1993) at the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro.

Herger goes on to say:

"While this document was agreed to by the United Nations, the United States is a party to the agreement only by our membership in the U.N. For the agreement to become legally binding, it would require submission to the U.S. Senate for ratification by the President. This has not occurred. Again, 'Agenda 21' is not legally binding on the United States."

Wrong!

Actually, the document was adopted by 179 nations, including the signature of George H.W. Bush. A nation's signature on a U.N. document obligates the nation to do nothing in opposition to the goals of the document, and to promote implementation of the document's recommendations. Agenda 21 is not a treaty subject to Senate ratification. It was never intended to be a treaty. (Bill Clinton signed the Kyoto Protocol. Because his signature obligated the U.S., George W. Bush took the unusual action to have the U.S. signature removed from the document.) At the same conference, however, two treaties were adopted by the U.N.: The framework Convention on Climate Change, signed by Bush and ratified by the Senate; and the Convention on Biological Diversity, not signed by Bush, signed by Clinton, but not ratified by the Senate.

Nothing in Agenda 21 is legally binding on any government until a government—at any level—adopts an Agenda 21 recommendation as a law or ordinance, or as an Executive Order such as EO 12852 issued by President Bill Clinton in 1993 in response to Agenda 21 recommendation 8.7:

“Governments, in cooperation, where appropriate, with international organizations, should adopt a national strategy for sustainable development...”

Bill Clinton's EO created the “President's Council on Sustainable Development” expressly for the purpose of implementing the recommendations in Agenda 21 throughout federal, state, and local governments. The EPA and other federal agencies offered challenge grants to state and local government to promote the implementation of the recommendations in Agenda 21. The federal government gave more than \$5 million to the American Planning Association to produce “Growing Smart: Legislative Guidebook,” which provides model legislation for states that, when adopted, requires counties and cities to adopt recommendations found in Agenda 21.

Herger says further: “There are innumerable reasons to be concerned about the United Nations, but I don't believe the toothless “Agenda 21” is one of them.”

Sadly, Herger's lack of knowledge about Agenda 21 is shared by most elected officials. The recommendations in Agenda 21 are presented as Smart Growth, Sustainable Communities, Greenways, and a host of similar buzz words. Agenda 21 is toothless until a local government incorporates Agenda 21 recommendations into their comprehensive land use plans. Then the recommendations have the force of law.

A U.N. accredited non-government organization called ICLEI (International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives) exists at the behest of the U.N. for the purpose of helping local governments implement the recommendations in Agenda 21. ICLEI has contracts with more than 600 U.S. cities and counties and is working diligently to spread its gospel even further.

Rep Herger, and all elected officials, should learn more about Agenda 21 and its effect on communities where it has been implemented. People in Los Angeles County are being removed (17:35) from their own private property for non-compliance with Agenda 21 recommendations included in recently adopted building codes. People are being forced to live where they do not want to live because of Urban Boundary Zones, and arbitrary and, unreasonable acreage requirements for a single dwelling. The free videos available here are a great place for elected officials, and everyone else, to begin their education on Agenda 21 and sustainable development. This same site offers a wealth of detailed, well-documented information on Agenda 21, its source, history, and effect.

Elected officials must learn what Agenda 21 is before opening their mouths and revealing their ignorance.

Henry Lamb

Most recent columns

Henry is the executive vice president of the Environmental Conservation Organization (ECO), and chairman of Sovereignty International.

Henry Lamb can be reached at: henry@freedom.org

Older articles by Henry Lamb

http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/44413?utm_source=CFP+Mailout&utm_campaign=c1f4f791b5-Call to Champions&utm_medium=email

[Economic Aspects](#) | [Natural Resource Aspects](#) | [Institutional Aspects](#) | [Social Aspects](#) | [USA](#)

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

<http://www.un.org/esa/agenda21/natinfo/countr/usa/eco.htm>

~~~~~

Home page related to above link

## **UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs - Division for Sustainable Development**

National Information

### **National Information by Country or Organization**

National reporting follows guidelines provided by the Secretariat that are consistent with the agenda established for each session of the CSD. In 2003, in the wake of the 2002 Johannesburg World Summit, the CSD established a new multi-year work programme through the year 2017.

[http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/dsd\\_aofw\\_ni/ni\\_index.shtml?utm\\_source=OldRedirect&utm\\_medium=redirect&utm\\_content=dsd&utm\\_campaign=OldRedirect](http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/dsd_aofw_ni/ni_index.shtml?utm_source=OldRedirect&utm_medium=redirect&utm_content=dsd&utm_campaign=OldRedirect)

# UN Economic and Social Development

## Division for Sustainable Development

CSD > Multi-Year Programme of Work

### CSD Multi-Year Programme of Work

#### 2004/2005 to 2016/2017

##### Seven Two-Year Cycles

At its eleventh session, the Commission on Sustainable Development decided that its multi-year programme of work beyond 2003 would be organized on the basis of seven two-year cycles, with each cycle focusing on selected thematic clusters of issues, as set out in the table below.

##### Review & Policy Years

The seven two-year cycles include Review and Policy Years. The Review Year will evaluate progress made in implementing sustainable development goals and identifying obstacles and constraints, while the Policy Year will decide on measures to speed up implementation and mobilize action to overcome these obstacles and constraints.

##### Thematic Clusters of Each Cycle

In each cycle, the thematic clusters of issues will be addressed in an integrated manner, taking into account economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. The Commission agreed that the implementation process should cover all these issues equally and noted that the selection of some issues for a given cycle did not diminish the importance of the commitments undertaken with respect to the issues to be considered in future cycles.

The Commission further agreed that means of implementation should be addressed in every cycle and for every relevant issue, action and commitment. Linkages to other cross-cutting issues are also to be addressed in every cycle, as shown below.

| Cycle                                                    | Thematic cluster                                                                                           | Cross-cutting issues                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2004/2005<br>CSD-12/CSD-13<br>Implementation<br>Cycle #1 | Water<br>Sanitation<br>Human Settlements                                                                   | Poverty eradication, Changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, Protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development, Sustainable development in a globalizing world, Health and sustainable development, Sustainable development of SIDS, Sustainable development for Africa, Other regional initiatives, Means of implementation, Institutional framework for sustainable development, Gender equality, and Education |
| 2006/2007<br>CSD-14/CSD-15<br>Implementation<br>Cycle #2 | Energy for Sustainable Development<br>Industrial Development<br>Air Pollution/Atmosphere<br>Climate Change | Poverty eradication, Changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, Protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development, Sustainable development in a globalizing world, Health and sustainable development, Sustainable development of SIDS, Sustainable development for Africa, Other regional initiatives, Means of implementation, Institutional framework for sustainable                                             |

|                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2008/2009<br>CSD-16/CSD-17<br>Implementation<br>Cycle #3  | Agriculture<br>Rural Development<br>Land<br>Drought<br>Desertification<br>Africa                                                                                                          | development, Gender equality, and Education<br>Poverty eradication, Changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, Protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development, Sustainable development in a globalizing world, Health and sustainable development, Sustainable development of SIDS, Sustainable development for Africa, Other regional initiatives, Means of implementation, Institutional framework for sustainable development, Gender equality, and Education |
| 2010/2011*<br>CSD-18/CSD-19<br>Implementation<br>Cycle #4 | Transport<br>Chemicals<br>Waste Management<br>(Hazardous & Solid Waste)<br>Mining<br>A Ten Year<br>Framework of<br>Programmes on<br>Sustainable<br>Consumption and<br>Production Patterns | Poverty eradication, Changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, Protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development, Sustainable development in a globalizing world, Health and sustainable development, Sustainable development of SIDS, Sustainable development for Africa, Other regional initiatives, Means of implementation, Institutional framework for sustainable development, Gender equality, and Education                                                |
| 2012/2013*<br>CSD-20/CSD-21<br>Implementation<br>Cycle #5 | Forests<br>Biodiversity<br>Biotechnology<br>Tourism<br>Mountains                                                                                                                          | Poverty eradication, Changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, Protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development, Sustainable development in a globalizing world, Health and sustainable development, Sustainable development of SIDS, Sustainable development for Africa, Other regional initiatives, Means of implementation, Institutional framework for sustainable development, Gender equality, and Education                                                |
| 2014/2015*<br>CSD-22/CSD-23<br>Implementation<br>Cycle #6 | Oceans and Seas<br>Marine Resources<br>Small Island<br>Developing States<br>Disaster<br>Management and<br>Vulnerability                                                                   | Poverty eradication, Changing unsustainable patterns of consumption and production, Protecting and managing the natural resource base of economic and social development, Sustainable development in a globalizing world, Health and sustainable development, Sustainable development of SIDS, Sustainable development for Africa, Other regional initiatives, Means of implementation, Institutional framework for sustainable development, Gender equality, and Education                                                |

|                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                      |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2016/2017<br>CSD-24/CSD-24<br>Implementation<br>Cycle #7 | Overall appraisal of<br>implementation of Agenda<br>21, the Programme of<br>Further Implementation of<br>Agenda 21 and the<br>Johannesburg Plan of<br>Implementation |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

\* This thematic cluster will remain as part of the multiyear programme of work as scheduled, unless otherwise agreed by the Commission.

---

Copyright © United Nations 2009 | Terms of Use | Privacy Notice  
Comments and suggestions

To: | Cc: Bcc: |  
 Cc: |  
 Bcc: |  
 Subject: | Picture |

## You Must Know These 3 Definitions: Property, Land, Premises

October 24, 2007

By Julie Kay Smithson, property rights researcher [propertyrights@earthlink.net](mailto:propertyrights@earthlink.net)

<http://www.propertyrightsresearch.org>

In order to protect your property rights, you must first know the difference between the definitions of property, land, and premises. If you do not know their meanings, you cannot effectively protect your property rights, i.e., your freedom. Premises, a recently touted definition, is being used to implement the "National Animal Identification System," or "NAIS." Substituting "premises" for "property" effectively renders property rights null and void. This use of a term (and its meaning, which is often not publicized) is no accident. Property is by far the most powerful legal term, but you can lose your property rights -- your ability to admit or deny access, utilize your property, sell or mortgage it, etc., if you do not know the three meanings *and the context in which they are employed*.

This is why property rights champions, researchers, activists, etc., are so adamantly opposed to "NAIS" and any other restrictions to their property rights.

Government agencies -- from various Department of Interior branches (Bureau of Land Management, or BLM; National Park Service, or NPS; U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, or USFWS / FWS / "the Service," etc.) to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service (FS), Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and others -- regularly refer to property as mere "land" and property owners as mere "land owners." If left unchallenged and uncorrected, this spells the extinction of property rights. Sleeping on one's rights is no excuse in the legal and judicial worlds.

Property rights are vital to your freedom and inseparable from it. Without them, you are nothing more than a tenant paying taxes on property over which you have lost some, most, or all of your rights.

Property - Something that is owned or possessed. Property may be real (land), personal, tangible (touchable), or intangible (such as the interest in a play or other creative work). - U.S. Treasury OTS (Office of Thrift Supervision, in charge of banks, savings and loan associations, etc.) <http://www.ots.treas.gov/glossary/gloss-p.html>

Land - Real property or any interest therein. [http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx\\_01/25cfr151\\_01.html](http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx_01/25cfr151_01.html)

Premises - A physical location that represents a unique and describable geographic entity where activity affecting the health and/or traceability of animals may occur. In cases involving non-contiguous properties, the producer/owner should consult with his/her State Animal Health

Official or Area Veterinarian in Charge to determine whether there is a need for one or multiple premises numbers. - National Animal Identification System (NAIS) A User Guide And Additional Information Resources Draft Version November 2006 - Glossary [http://animalid.aphis.usda.gov/nais/naislibrary/documents/guidelines/User\\_Guide.htm](http://animalid.aphis.usda.gov/nais/naislibrary/documents/guidelines/User_Guide.htm)

"The three great rights are so bound together as to be essentially one right. To give a man his life, but deny him his liberty, is to take from him all that makes his life worth living. To give him his liberty, but take from him the property which is the fruit and badge of his liberty, is to still leave him a slave." - George Sutherland, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, 1921.

OK Corral Enterprises, LLC.  
Home of Cow Cufflinks and  
Horse Tamer Pro Products  
6631 East Ashard Road  
Clare, Michigan 48617  
Phone: 1-989-386-2910  
fax: 432-225-6261  
[www.hobbleman.net](http://www.hobbleman.net)

—Original Message—

From: Nancy Levant

Sent: 3/11/2005 4:40:21 AM Pacific Standard Time

Subject: Please Read

Regarding the plight of the Upper Peninsula in Michigan, we have found a few things that I hope will get the attention of all of you. We need your help to research and get the word out. Please read the following:  
Please forward this message as widely as possible.

I'm still researching TNC's U.S. "500 functional conservation landscapes and 2000 functional conservation areas" that I found online this this week. Believe U.P. of Michigan is one of the 500, as they are setting the stage for the whole U.P. to become a huge functional "working forest" landscape per their U.P. Conservation Report.

"Working" doesn't mean hunting, fishing, trapping, logging, or much of anything, as humans put stress on eco-systems..or so they claim. It means that little eco-systems in the landscape "work" in unison so the whole thing becomes "functional".

Humans are referred to as "situations" in the material I've read so far, but I've yet to learn how we're to be handled if we don't go along with scheme. I've also read on one site that all "feral ungulates" (deer, elk, etc.) are to be eliminated in 90% of the "mesics" in these functional landscapes, but unable to determine if one, some, or all. Mesics are wet to semi-wet areas. Had trouble accessing site where all that was written, but it has to do with Efroymson Workshops and TNC's conservation plan for the U.P. was taken to one of these workshops to plan out what they call a 5-S program. Efroymson is Dan, and is deceased. There is an Efroymson Fellowship Program, and it has pumped out over 180 landscape project teams. TNC is partnered with state and federal gov'n't agencies, as well as the U.N.'s International Union for the Conservation of Nature. They will also be protecting species on the IUCN's "red alert" list...what ever that entails... On one site was written "Think Globally, Act Locally"...

[http://conserveonline.org/2003/09//en/Landscape\\_Practitioners\\_Handbook\\_July03\\_-\\_NEW.pdf](http://conserveonline.org/2003/09//en/Landscape_Practitioners_Handbook_July03_-_NEW.pdf)

# DEMINT: White House land grab

## ***Proposal to seize land would favor animals over Americans***

Tuesday, Mar 2nd, 2010

By Sen. Jim DeMint

You'd think the Obama administration is busy enough controlling the banks, insurance companies and automakers, but thanks to whistleblowers at the Department of the Interior, **we now learn they're planning to increase their control over energy-rich land in the West.**

**A secret administration memo has surfaced revealing plans for the federal government to seize more than 10 million acres from Montana to New Mexico, halting job-creating activities like ranching, forestry, mining and energy development. Worse, this land grab would dry up tax revenue that's essential for funding schools, firehouses and community centers.**

President Obama could enact the plans in this memo with just the stroke of a pen, without any input from the communities affected by it.

At a time when our national unemployment rate is 9.7 percent, it is unbelievable anyone would be looking to stop job-creating energy enterprises, yet that's exactly what's happening.

The document lists 14 properties that, according to the document, "might be good candidates" for Mr. Obama to nab through presidential proclamation. Apparently, Washington bureaucrats believe it's more important to preserve grass and rocks for birdwatchers and backpackers than to keep these local economies thriving.

Administration officials claim the document is merely the product of a brainstorming session, but anyone who reads this memo can see that it is a wish list for the environmentalist left. It discusses, in detail, what kinds of animal populations would benefit from limiting human activity in those areas.

**The 21-page document, marked "Internal Draft-NOT FOR RELEASE," names 14 different lands Mr. Obama could completely close for development by unilaterally designating them as "monuments" under the 1906 Antiquities Act.**

It says all kinds of animals would be better off by doing so, like the coyotes, badgers, grouse, chickens and lizards. But giving the chickens more room to roost is no reason for the government to override states' rights.

**Rep. Robert Bishop, Utah Republican, made the memo public because he didn't want another unilateral land grab by the White House, like what happened under former Presidents Bill Clinton and Jimmy Carter.**

Using the Antiquities Act, President Carter locked up more land than any other president had before him, taking more than 50 million acres in Alaska despite strong opposition from the state.



SOURCE <http://www.newswithviews.com/Levant/nancy106.htm>

# BIOSPHERE RESERVES - THE KINGPIN OF GATED COMMUNITIES

Nancy Levant  
September 11, 2007  
NewsWithViews.com

Due to the fact that we now live according to legislated lies and scams of global/elite proportion, "conspiracy" takes on whole new meaning. Laws are conspiracies. Media is conspiracy. Ivy League academia (in particular) teaches conspiracy. Professional think tank organizations invent conspiracies. Corporations finance conspiracies. Big Pharma, public and higher mental education, and banks carry forth conspiracies. And we, the people, who watchdog the dogs, are conspiracy theorists. So, conspiracy it is - and it rules our days.

Every time another watchdog is discredited as a liar, is harassed, or publicly or physically destroyed, one can rest assured that that theorist was on to something or someone. After all, elimination of the enemy is the name of conspiracy's game. But when there are so many conspiracies to behold and chase, one realizes that the political world has become a very surreal place - albeit very akin to tell-a-vision.

The world now realizes that the biodiversity/ecology-based land confiscation scheme is a scam of global proportions, and invented by money power, think tanks, philanthropic organizations and elites, and their political and non-profit prostitutes. That secret is out of the bag. But one fascinating component of their "sustainability" MO is the Biosphere Reserve system.

Not one ordinary human being on Earth had any say, whatsoever, about the taking of the world's most pristine and beautiful wilderness areas. To my knowledge, the total, global, confiscated acreage has never been published as the Biosphere Reserves system also includes "conservation corridors" and "buffer zones." We need to know that figure, but we never will. The truthful reason for the Biosphere system is unknown. Some say the Biosphere lands were taken for their water, timber, and mineral value. That makes sense, and also goes hand in hand with herding of populations into "human settlements," as called for by the U.N.'s Agenda 21. This allows globalist elites and their corporations to strip-mine ecological wealth with some privacy. It also gives credence to a Communist/Socialist system of corporate-governmental ownership of everything that has fundamental monetary value and intrinsic worth AND total control of agriculture and water, which in translation means basic human needs.

Some say that taxable watershed systems located within the Biosphere Reserves are the prize desired by the U.N. to raise the funds for the one-world global military and to ration the water of all commoners. This, too, makes sense in light of collapsing borders, sovereign nations, and angry and impoverished citizens.

On the other side of the conspiracy fence, it has also been suggested that "crisis" is invented to

manipulate the masses. In light of the past 5 years, many bright people now consider orchestrated crisis to be of legitimate concern as 911 brought with it the demise of the American Constitution, new homeland paramilitary organizations and control, and the global government's political bureaucracy system - Communitarianism. So, in truth, all conspiracies are more than food for thought at this final stage of corrupted political games. We simply can't allow, nor should we ever have allowed, verbatim belief in "the elected" or in science ever again. There are too many lies, cover-ups, and, frankly, professional and highly educated thieves.

And as each day passes, and questions of unethical doings amongst the world's power brokers continue to be raised, and as one observes the scrambling of leadership and their media propagandists; as the world observes their great discomfort while the global watchdogs amass strength and power in growing numbers, and the elite make legislative plans to shut down freedom of speech using new armies in the name of "combatants," the conspiracies thicken as truth awaits its turn in the global spotlight. We know it's coming, but we also know Martial Law is coming.

Who knows when lies rule the day, and people are forced to seek out truth at great risk to their very lives. We do, however, know that many, many people have died due to their close proximity to truth - dead microbiologists, for instance. It is therefore very likely that as more and more truth unfolds, thanks to the efforts of the global watchdog community, small/independent media, and many others worldwide, the world will become a more volatile and dangerous place. The purveyors of lies, especially the big lies, really, really hate to get caught.

And as for the Biosphere Reserves, it has been suggested that they may be home to the world's elite when the "big crisis" hits, as they will be fully separated from the masses in our human settlements - their own personal dreamy and roadless fairy lands, so to speak. It has also been suggested that the corralling of commoners into "human settlements" makes the intention of massive depopulation 1) easier to achieve, and 2) establishes large and clear targets for depopulation missions. However, as cash/profit/power/fear is the M.O. of the world's elite, many questions remain as to the purpose of global land confiscation and human corralling. It will all be discovered and uncovered soon enough. However, our dilemma is this: ask your neighbors and family about Biosphere Reserves. They've never heard of them. Nor do they realize that all Biosphere Reserves are crawling with grant-funded (translation: governmentally funded) scientists.

If 1 + 1 still rings a bell, I would be concerned about 1) pandemic, 2) crashing markets, and 3) martial law paramilitary control, which in fact may have been raised as armies to protect America's elite while we, the rabble, suffer unspeakably in our condensed human settlements. Somehow, Biosphere Reserves and depopulation go hand in hand. Perhaps Biosphere Reserves are the kingpin of "gated" communities.